<h2>Site HA 220 (Matthew Baker Caravan Site - South Field) and</h2> <h2>Site HA 609 (Land East of Maes Curig)</h2> <h2>This GE overlay will help you to appreciate where the sites in the Parrog Hill Area are.</h2> <h2>Parrog Hill Sites Map</h2> * In essence the Group takes the view that the allocation of these sites is impractical, not viable and undesirable for the reasons set out in the arguments. In particular we are astounded by the excuses found by the NPA for the quite remarkanble fact that it was not untill they were well over two years into the development of the LDP process, and advertising the present Statutory Deposit Version of the Plan, that they thought to post notices on the entrace to the Caravan Site and then only thereby let Mr Meyrick and his family, the longstanding site owners and land tenants, who are utterly opposed to the use of this site for residential housing instead, know of their intention to so recommend this site for an affordable housing allocation. <p style="line-height:" 14.4pt;">\Phi The highway problems concerning the access to the site, and onto Parrog Road off the A487(T), are well know to towns people. The Group is also concerned about the loss of economic and social contribution to the extended holiday season which would result from the replacement of the static caravan visitors with 'affordable' homes residents. <p style="line-height:" 14.4pt;">See our formal submissions on the two allocations proposed for this site here : <p style="line-height: 14.4pt;">Site 220 : South field allocation site \& <p style="line-height: 14.4pt;">Site 609♦: Land East of Maes Curig \&\right <p style="line-height: 14.4pt;">Submissions relevant to both sites at Preferred Strategy Stage 2008 (NAEG

006) * <p style="line-height: 14.4pt;"> < strong> < span style="font-family: ">Site 771♦ (Land beneath Maes Curig) <p style="line-height: 14.4pt;">\Phi It is important to repeat here that it is the firm policy of the Group not to support or oppose any particular individual proposal for the allocation of land for housing in Newport, but rather to test and examine the rationale and policy based justifications offered by the PCNPA for having approved or rejected them, from the perspective of seeking an consistent, rationale, comprehensive final plan and thus from the desire to create achievable plan proposals in this regard. style="line-height: 14.4pt;">\Phi In this regard we note that the NPA has informed several representatives for alternative housing sites in the Park that their proposals are in effect automatically precluded in their view either because the site has been previously rejected by themselves on a planning application, or particularly because it has been rejected by the Inspector who considered it at the time of the JUDP inquiry process. Accordingly, we wonder why an apparently very different standard has been applied with respect to this site. Details of the relevant planning hiistory background are to found in the following separate Report : <p style="line-height: 14.4pt;">Report on Site 771.